

PUBLIC MEETING ON THE DRAFT EIR FOR THE  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON  
VALLEY-IVYGLEN SUBTRANSMISSION PROJECT AND  
ALBERHILL SYSTEM PROJECT

PUBLIC MEETING ON THE  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

MAY 11, 2016

6:15 p.m. to 7:31 p.m.

City of Lake Elsinore  
Cultural Arts Center  
183 N. Main Street  
Lake Elsinore, CA 92530

Reported by: Elizabeth Egli  
CSR No. 6241

1 APPEARANCES

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC),  
Energy Division:

Jensen Uchida, Project Manager

Ecology and Environment, Inc. (E & E):

Silvia Yanez, Senior Environmental Specialist

Caitlin Barns, Deputy Project Manager/Biologist

Kristi Black, Planner

Jessica Midbust, Environmental Planner

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I N D E X

PAGE

INTRODUCTIONS	5
PURPOSE OF THIS MEETING	6
HOW TO COMMENT ON THE DRAFT EIR	6
CEQA AND CPUC REVIEW PROCESSES	7
DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT	11
OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT	12
QUESTION AND ANSWER	16
VERBAL COMMENTS	43
SPEAKERS	
Terry Morarty	
John Gray	
Ace Vallejos	
Larry Namedal	
Chris Hyland	
John O'Doherty	
Bruce Slingerland	
Barbara Paul	
Leonard Leichnitz	
Mike Matthews	
Linda Ridenour	
Grant Taylor	
Kim Cousins	

1           Public Meeting on the Draft Eir for the  
2                   Southern California Edison  
3           Valley-Ivyglen Subtransmission Project and  
4                   Alberhill System Project

5                           -O-

6           KRISTI BLACK: Thanks, everyone, for coming. This  
7 is the public meeting on the Draft EIR for Southern  
8 California Edison project for Valley-Ivyglen  
9 Subtransmission Project and the Alberhill System Project.

10                   Please make sure that you signed in at the  
11 front desk. If you didn't, you can do that at the end of  
12 the meeting. If you'd like to make a verbal remark,  
13 please do fill out a speaker card. You can do that. If  
14 20 minutes from now you decide you want to, you can sign  
15 up later. And if you'd like to submit a written comment  
16 tonight, we do have forms that you can fill out, but you  
17 can also submit written comments after the meeting.

18 We'll talk about how to do that later in the  
19 presentation.

20                   If you could please turn off your cell phones  
21 or put them to silent mode, that would be very much  
22 appreciated.

23                   Emergency exit locations, through the front  
24 door and also through the back door.

25                   Restrooms are through this door back here.



1 going forward, Rachel James is going to be the project  
2 manager for Ecology and Environment, just so you know the  
3 name.

4

5 PURPOSE OF THIS MEETING

6

7 KRISTI BLACK: So what's the purpose of this  
8 meeting? This is the California Public Utilities  
9 Commission's meeting. Southern California Edison has  
10 submitted two applications to the CPUC, one through the  
11 Valley-Ivyglen Project and the other is for the Alberhill  
12 System Project.

13 The CPUC is the CEQA Lead Agency for both  
14 projects. CPUC prepared and released a Draft EIR that  
15 covers both of the projects, and this meeting is to share  
16 information about the Draft EIR, and also to get input  
17 from the public on what to include in the Final EIR.

18

19 HOW TO COMMENT ON THE DRAFT EIR

20

21 KRISTI BLACK: Here are the ways that you can  
22 comment on the content of the Draft EIR. As I stated  
23 before, you can make a verbal comment tonight, fill out a  
24 speaker card.

25 The public comment period for the Draft EIR

1 extends all the way until May 31st, which is the day  
2 after the holiday. So you can either fill out or return  
3 a comment form this evening, and we have those at the  
4 front table here. But you can also e-mail a letter or  
5 mail a letter or fax a letter anytime up until that May  
6 31st date.

#### 8 CEQA AND CPUC REVIEW PROCESSES

9  
10 KRISTI BLACK: So Jensen is here tonight, but I'm  
11 going to give what he would normally give for his  
12 presentation, and that's talking about the CEQA and CPUC  
13 review process for projects.

14 The California Public Utilities Commission  
15 regulates public utilities in California, and that  
16 includes energy, telecommunications, natural gas, water  
17 and certain types of transportation companies. The  
18 purpose of CPUC's regulation is to make sure these  
19 services are provided to the public in a safe and  
20 reliable manner and at a reasonable price. So when a  
21 utility proposes to build or expand its facilities in  
22 California, the utility has to file an application with  
23 the CPUC.

24 Depending on the type of the facility the  
25 utility intends to build and the level of power the

1 facility will disseminate, the applicant must submit an  
2 application for either a certificate of public necessity  
3 and convenience or a permit to construct. In this case  
4 SCE filed a CPCN for the Alberhill System Project and a  
5 PTC for the Valley-Ivyglen project. And along with the  
6 application, the project proponent submits a proponent's  
7 environmental assessment based on a checklist that CPUC  
8 has adopted.

9           The PEA is supposed to be based on the CPUC's  
10 information and criteria list in order to determine  
11 whether the application for the projects is complete.  
12 The applicant has to submit this information before an  
13 application can be determined to be complete. The filing  
14 of that application is what starts two concurrent review  
15 processes and those are shown on this slide over here.

16           The first process -- they're concurrent.

17           One process is the CEQA review process, and  
18 that's on the left, and there's also the CPUC economic  
19 review which is on the right, and it's known as the  
20 General Proceeding.

21           The General Proceeding is conducted much like  
22 the legal proceeding in court. The proceeding looks at  
23 the effect of a proposed project on customer rates,  
24 market competition, market structure, and whether the  
25 proposed project will meet the needs of the people in

1 California.

2           The assigned commissioner, along with the  
3 assigned Administrative Law Judge, will jointly oversee  
4 this General Proceeding process.

5           The environmental review process, which the  
6 EIR is part of, is conducted in accordance with the  
7 California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA. To review  
8 the PEA and draft the environmental document, the CPUC  
9 hires an environmental consultant. In this case it was  
10 Ecology and Environment. Under the oversight of the  
11 CPUC, the environmental consultant reviews the  
12 applicant's PEA, performs the environmental review, and  
13 then drafts the environmental document.

14           The purpose of this review is to make the  
15 public aware of the potential environmental impacts of  
16 the proposed project. The document also includes  
17 potential mitigation measures that will reduce  
18 significant impacts of the proposed project and also a  
19 reasonable range of alternatives to the project that will  
20 reduce impacts. When it's determined the PEA and  
21 application contains sufficient information, this  
22 environmental review process begins.

23           The first major step in this process is a  
24 scoping meeting where the project team asks for  
25 information from the public to determine the range of

1 issues and the project alternatives that should be  
2 considered in the project's environmental document. Then  
3 we use various information, information gathered from the  
4 scoping meetings, from surveys in the field, and from  
5 research to draft the CEQA document. In this case it was  
6 an EIR.

7           The document identifies potential  
8 environmental impacts of the project and also identifies  
9 a project alternative that has the least environmental  
10 impacts based on the studies conducted during the  
11 environmental review. This is called the environmentally  
12 superior alternative. Upon publication, the draft  
13 environmental document is circulated to the public for a  
14 45-day public review period, and we're in that right now.  
15 During this period, comments are collected from the  
16 public. Once this review period has completed, all  
17 comments submitted on the Draft EIR are considered and  
18 we'll prepare responses to these comments in a Final EIR.

19           The Final EIR will then be given to the  
20 assigned Administrative Law Judge at the CPUC who  
21 incorporates major findings of the General Proceeding and  
22 the environmental document into a proposed decision. All  
23 five commissioners then vote on the decision at a  
24 commission meeting, and the CPUC will seek a decision  
25 about the project that starts the balance on power

1 production, land use, and environmental stewardship.

2 In the Q and A session that follows this,  
3 you're welcome to ask questions about that process. I  
4 know that's a lot to listen to. There's also more  
5 information online at the CPUC's website about this other  
6 parallel process that goes on. There's some information  
7 here, and we can provide that to you at the front desk if  
8 you're interested.

9 We're at this public meeting and it actually  
10 covers two projects. The CPUC determined it was in the  
11 public's best interest to consolidate the environmental  
12 reviews of both projects into one EIR for a few reasons,  
13 they're really close in proximity and sometimes the  
14 Alberhill project transmission lines are located on lines  
15 proposed for Valley-Ivyglen. There's overlapping  
16 impacts, particularly due to the close proximity, and  
17 there's similar construction timing.

18

#### 19 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

20

21 KRISTI BLACK: Now we're going to talk about the  
22 Valley-Ivyglen Project.

23 The Valley-Ivyglen Project mainly consists of  
24 a new single circuit of 115 kilovolt subtransmission  
25 line. There was a project that was approved by CPUC in

1 2010, and the project we're looking at right now follows  
2 mostly the same route as that project. There's some  
3 slight deviations. The subtransmission line that SCE is  
4 currently proposing would be about 27 miles long within  
5 about 23 miles of new right-of-way.

6 There will also be a telecommunications  
7 component.

8 There will be new fiber optic line installed  
9 overhead on the transmission structures underground and  
10 some new and some existing underground conduit.

11 Here's a map of the project. It's also  
12 available online at the project website to take a closer  
13 look, and we also have some map books up on the front  
14 table that have a more detailed look at the route.

#### 15 16 OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

17  
18 KRISTI BLACK: The objectives of the project --  
19 there's three of them that have been defined -- is to  
20 serve projected demand in the Electrical Needs Area,  
21 increase electrical reliability, and also improve  
22 operational and maintenance flexibility.

23 The Draft EIR is concluding that the  
24 Valley-Ivyglen Project would have unavoidable and  
25 significant impacts on air quality during construction,

1 and also noise generation during construction.

2           There are some other significant impacts of  
3 the Valley-Ivyglen Project, but the Draft EIR concludes  
4 that there's mitigation that could be implemented to  
5 reduce those impacts to less than significant, and that's  
6 for the following resources on this slide. So  
7 aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, and  
8 several others.

9           There's also some cumulatively considerable  
10 impacts from the Valley-Ivyglen Project. That's where  
11 Valley-Ivyglen in and of itself is one piece of a lot of  
12 other impacts from other projects in the area, and we  
13 found that for air quality and noise the Valley-Ivyglen  
14 would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a  
15 significant cumulative impact.

16           So we have an alternative screening report for  
17 the Valley-Ivyglen Project. In that report we looked at  
18 14 alternatives. Five of them were carried forward in  
19 the EIR in addition to the No Project Alternative. The  
20 No Project Alternative is what would happen if the CPUC  
21 denied the permit and the project wasn't implemented.

22           The Draft EIR identifies the Environmentally  
23 Superior Alternative as Alternative C, which involves an  
24 underground of 115-kV Segment VIG6 along Temescal Canyon  
25 Road and Horsethief Canyon Road. That's instead of

1 overhead alignment south of I-15 in the same area. And  
2 we do have maps of this at the front table.

3 Now onto the Alberhill Project.

4 The Alberhill Project involves constructing  
5 the Alberhill Substation. That's one of the objectives  
6 of the project. Another objective is to construct 500-kV  
7 transmission lines to connect it to an existing 500-kV  
8 transmission line, and it's also to construct new 115-kV  
9 transmission lines to modify how some existing  
10 substations operate in the grid, and also to install some  
11 telecommunication improvements.

12 Here's a map of the Alberhill Project, an  
13 overview map of where it is. You can see the substation  
14 is up in the upper left-hand portion of the map as are  
15 the 500-kV lines.

16 So the objectives of the projects are to  
17 relieve projected electrical demand; constructing a  
18 substation within the Electrical Needs Area; and also  
19 maintain system ties between a new 115-kV System and an  
20 existing 115-kV System.

21 The Alberhill System Project would have  
22 several significant and unavoidable impacts on the  
23 environment, and these are identified in the Draft EIR.  
24 There would be significant and unavoidable aesthetic  
25 impacts during operation and maintenance, mostly centered

1 in the substation area. There would also be significant  
2 unavoidable impacts on air quality and noise during  
3 construction of the proposed project.

4 Just as for Valley-Ivyglen, there is also  
5 several impacts where the Draft EIR has concluded that  
6 mitigation could be implemented to reduce those impacts  
7 to less than significant, and those are listed here.

8 Just like Valley-Ivyglen, Alberhill would also  
9 contribute to what's been identified as a significant  
10 cumulative impact when looking at the project with other  
11 projects going on in the area, and that would be for  
12 aesthetics, air quality and noise. For Alberhill we have  
13 an alternative screening report that looks at 34  
14 alternatives. Two of them were carried forward to the  
15 EIR, including the No Project Alternative.

16 The Draft EIR identifies Alternative DD as the  
17 environmentally superior alternative and that's an  
18 alternative substation location. It would be a few miles  
19 north of SCE's proposed substation location.

20 So for more information, both projects have  
21 their own project website, and you can also find these  
22 pretty easily by Googling CPUC Alberhill, CPUC  
23 Valley-Ivyglen. They're usually the first result that  
24 comes up.

25 Right now we can do an informal Q and A if

1 anyone has questions about the proposed project or the  
2 impacts or the Draft EIR, and then we can take a short  
3 break, and then after that we'll take formal comments.  
4 So if you have a comment, don't raise it now. This isn't  
5 the comment period. But if you have questions or  
6 anything like that, this would be the time to do it.

7

8 QUESTION AND ANSWER

9

10 KRISTI BLACK: Yes.

11 MS. RIDENOUR: My name is Linda Ridenour. I have a  
12 question. It's a significant hardship for me to try to  
13 download something like that on my computer, and I feel  
14 that you are perhaps discriminating against some of us  
15 elders who are not computer literate. So how do you plan  
16 to rectify that?

17 KRISTI BLACK: Well, we could provide you with a DVD  
18 that has the file. As far as paper copies, they've also  
19 been distributed to several libraries in the area.  
20 There's a list of the libraries on the notice of  
21 availability.

22 MS. RIDENOUR: How do we check those out so we can  
23 underline significant environmental problems?

24 KRISTI BLACK: Jensen, do you want to make it  
25 available for people at cost, or how would you like to do

1 that?

2 MS. RIDENOUR: I don't understand. If this is a  
3 public scoping meeting, and I don't think this is your  
4 first scoping meeting, is it? No. So some of us were  
5 not even invited to the first scoping meeting.

6 You have one notice in the newspaper today,  
7 unless you had others, okay. And we had insufficient  
8 time to prepare.

9 KRISTI BLACK: We put notices in two newspapers when  
10 the Draft EIR was released.

11 MS. RIDENOUR: What is the date for that?

12 KRISTI BLACK: We can get that for you, unless  
13 Jessica knows off the top of her head. She's the one who  
14 put the notice in.

15 MS. RIDENOUR: How would we know when the 45 days  
16 started?

17 KRISTI BLACK: It started in the release of the  
18 notice of availability. The notice of availability was  
19 released on April 14. And I don't know how the libraries  
20 work and whether you can check things out, but I would  
21 assume they might have a copy machine where you can make  
22 copies. You can also request a copy, but I think Jensen  
23 can speak to whether CPUC might charge or how that works.

24 MR. UCHIDA: I think the best idea is DVD.

25 MS. RIDENOUR: I'm sorry. I can't hear you.

1 MR. UCHIDA: I think that would be your best option  
2 is a DVD. I think that's the best we could do.

3 MS. RIDENOUR: You have those here tonight for us?

4 KRISTI BLACK: We can send you one.

5 MS. RIDENOUR: That would be the total project, not  
6 just the environmental components of it?

7 KRISTI BLACK: The CDs contain the entire Draft EIR.  
8 So that printed document right there at the front table,  
9 we have that on DVDs, and we can send you one.

10 MS. RIDENOUR: What date do we need to have our  
11 response in by?

12 KRISTI BLACK: The comment period closes on May  
13 31st, which is the day after the holiday.

14 Yes, in the back.

15 SPEAKER 2: Can you go back to the slide that has  
16 the web address for the comment period?

17 KRISTI BLACK: Yes.

18 SPEAKER 2: And does it have to be physically  
19 received by the 31st, or postmarked by the 31st?

20 KRISTI BLACK: I think I would say postmarked we  
21 would accept.

22 JENSEN UCHIDA: We'll accept anything that comes in  
23 around the date.

24 KRISTI BLACK: We do want your comments. I mean,  
25 that's an important part of the process.

1           SPEAKER 3: It says there postmarked by the 31st.  
2 We were trying to clarify that.

3           KRISTI BLACK: Jensen said around that.

4           JENSEN UCHIDA: As long as we receive something --

5           SPEAKER 3: It says on there.

6           KRISTI BLACK: Yes.

7           SPEAKER 4: I have a general question.

8           KRISTI BLACK: Sure.

9           SPEAKER 4: Overhead transmission lines generate an  
10 electromagnetic field, the effects of which are not  
11 entirely certain. Could you contrast the overhead  
12 transmission line electromagnetic field with an  
13 underground transmission line of the same voltage and  
14 amperage?

15           KRISTI BLACK: I would suggest submitting that as a  
16 comment on the Draft EIR, if that's something you want to  
17 see in the document, because that speaks to the impacts  
18 of the project, not the content of the Draft EIR or the  
19 proposed project.

20           SPEAKER 5: There's been several Draft EIR's that's  
21 been approved and commented four times now. Is this the  
22 beginning of No. 5? Or the end of No. 5?

23           KRISTI BLACK: I don't know the exact number off the  
24 top of my head. There have been several, and as I  
25 mentioned in the presentation, there was actually an

1 approval of Valley-Ivyglen in 2010.

2 For Alberhill there hasn't been a Draft EIR  
3 yet. There have been three scoping periods. The one  
4 last year was the third.

5 For Valley-Ivyglen, for the new application, I  
6 believe this is the first.

7 Is that correct?

8 JENSEN UCHIDA: Yes.

9 KRISTI BLACK: This is the first for the new  
10 resubmitted modified Valley-Ivyglen Project.

11 SPEAKER 5: Is this with both of them combined?

12 KRISTI BLACK: Yes, both of them are covered.  
13 They're still separate permit application processes. So  
14 if you were to look up the administrative proceeding,  
15 they would be separate, but as far as --

16 SPEAKER 5: Are they coming together?

17 KRISTI BLACK: Not in that proceeding. But because  
18 there are so many similarities, the CPUC decided having  
19 one EIR that covers both made more sense and would be  
20 better, maybe just less confusing and not -- but would be  
21 better than having two separate documents. So the  
22 processes for both projects under CEQA and environmental  
23 review are now tracking each other.

24 Does that help clarify? It's complex.

25 SPEAKER 5: It helps a little bit, but I'm kind of

1 wondering when the reviews are going to be final. I  
2 mean, of course they've said this is the final several  
3 times. Now we're at another final.

4 KRISTI BLACK: The Final EIR will contain the  
5 response to comments on the Draft EIR, and barring any  
6 changes -- like if SCE changes their project, then we  
7 might need to go back. But barring any changes, the  
8 Final EIR would be certified, which means the CPUC finds  
9 it's adequate, and then it would go in to the  
10 Administrative Law Judge Proceeding where then they would  
11 consider approval of a CPCN or PTC, and then the  
12 schedules might vary because those are two separate  
13 processes for the two separate projects.

14 SPEAKER 7: How are we to be involved in that?

15 KRISTI BLACK: I have information on another slide  
16 about the administrative proceeding. So I recommend  
17 contacting the Public Advisor. Their role is to help  
18 people be involved in the administrative proceeding.

19 SPEAKER 8: Just a general question. Within the  
20 boundaries of Lake Elsinore, what percentage or  
21 approximately what percentage of the lines would be  
22 undergrounded, and what percentage would be above ground?  
23 And how many other poles are you combining on these poles  
24 to eliminate the existing lines with the new lines?

25 KRISTI BLACK: That is a good question. As far as

1 SCE's proposed project there -- and SCE can correct me if  
2 I'm wrong, because this is off the top of my head.

3 For Valley-Ivyglen, one segment which is  
4 Segment VIG8 is proposed to be underground, and in the  
5 Draft EIR we have the mileage of that, but I want to say  
6 it's five --

7 Two. SCE is in the back.

8 Two out of 25 miles or so for Valley-Ivyglen,  
9 27 miles. So less than 10 percent of Valley-Ivyglen.

10 For Alberhill, none of the lines are being  
11 proposed underground.

12 SPEAKER 7: Is there a reason?

13 KRISTI BLACK: That would be a question for SCE.

14 I'm not SCE.

15 I'm with Ecology and Environment, and we work  
16 for California Public Utilities Commission. The public  
17 utilities commission is not a proponent for or against  
18 the project. So we're just looking at the environmental  
19 impacts of the project.

20 SPEAKER 7: Now, if they take into consideration the  
21 environmental impact, that's all there is, on  
22 undergrounding more of the lines?

23 KRISTI BLACK: I believe we looked at undergrounding  
24 all of Valley-Ivyglen as an agency, Alternative M, and we  
25 did look at that.

1 SPEAKER 7: Thank you.

2 KRISTI BLACK: Yes.

3 SPEAKER 8: City of Lake Elsinore is going to have  
4 severe aesthetic problems, I think, going along 3rd  
5 Street and along Highway 74, if I read it right. Also,  
6 over by the inlet channel there's part of a parachuting  
7 type of activity over there starting to get people, and,  
8 you know, with high type power lines with aircraft and  
9 that kind of stuff in that area --

10 KRISTI BLACK: As far as the conflicts with the  
11 recreational users, I don't remember off the top of my  
12 head, but when we take a break we can go look at the  
13 Draft EIR.

14 SPEAKER 8: Looking at the routing of some of the  
15 lines going in, it's kind of hard to figure out -- are  
16 there already eminent domain on all those line ways that  
17 they're going to put the lines in?

18 KRISTI BLACK: No.

19 SPEAKER 8: So they still have to go through the  
20 eminent domain process?

21 KRISTI BLACK: Right.

22 SPEAKER 8: So the people that own the property  
23 don't know that they're going to try to take the property  
24 yet?

25 KRISTI BLACK: I don't know if they might do private

1 negotiation. That's not part of the EIR because that  
2 process in and of itself doesn't have environmental  
3 impacts. So we look at what happens when SCE builds  
4 something.

5 SPEAKER 8: Does this have anything to do with the  
6 power lines that originally were going to go -- I think  
7 they were going to go straight to San Diego. They had  
8 another routing at one time, and that project got killed.

9 KRISTI BLACK: I don't know the answer to that  
10 question.

11 SPEAKER 9: Not to sound cynical, we were at a  
12 previous environmental impact meeting, and we did put  
13 proposals in for some modifications, primarily going  
14 underground in certain areas. It sounds as though those  
15 proposals aren't going to happen, potentially.

16 My question to you is, do we really have an  
17 impact here? Is this plan already pretty much  
18 implemented, and will our comments really have much  
19 impact, personally, do you think?

20 KRISTI BLACK: I will say, in the Final EIR we are  
21 mandated to respond to your comments in writing. And as  
22 far as making a decision about the project, it's not  
23 Jensen's job at the CPUC or our job to have a stance on  
24 whether the project is good or bad.

25 The Draft EIR isn't about merit. It's about

1 disclosure and telling the decision-makers what the  
2 environmental impacts are of the decision that they are  
3 expected to make on the project, whether that be approve  
4 the project, deny the project, or approve an alternative.

5 SPEAKER 10: When do they determine to go  
6 underground? For example, in Alberhill they have no  
7 underground. Well, there's one section going down Conard  
8 that is going in everybody's front yard. They don't show  
9 any of that in these pictures. These pictures show dirt  
10 and hills that are dead. All these are homes, and  
11 they're planning on, like 11 or 12 going across Conard,  
12 which to me seems it should go underground, and to most  
13 everybody in that area.

14 KRISTI BLACK: I would recommend submitting that as  
15 a comment.

16 SPEAKER 10: I believe it has been submitted several  
17 times.

18 KRISTI BLACK: Okay. On the Draft EIR I would  
19 recommend submitting that as a comment.

20 SPEAKER 11: In the preparation of the EIR, what  
21 number was used for the cost differential between high  
22 tension lines versus undergrounding? Was there a dollar  
23 amount attached to those?

24 So you're making a determination,  
25 recommendation, for a specific alternative, and one being

1 undergrounding the entire project, but that wasn't  
2 considered or that was not accepted or promoted.

3           And my question is, there must have been a  
4 cost consideration that you people drafting the EIR had  
5 to come up with. So do you know what that was?

6           KRISTI BLACK: Part of looking at alternatives  
7 includes feasibility, which includes economic  
8 feasibility, but there are several other components that  
9 you would look at, such as reducing substantially or  
10 avoiding a significant environmental impact of the  
11 proposed project and meeting the project objectives. So  
12 the analysis of the alternatives and why we selected in  
13 the Draft EIR certain alternatives environmentally  
14 superior is all in the Draft EIR, including how we waive  
15 those factors.

16           SPEAKER 12: Are the economic factors included in  
17 that to the residents of Lake Elsinore?

18           KRISTI BLACK: What do you mean? Can you clarify?

19           SPEAKER 12: The economic impact to the residents of  
20 Lake Elsinore, are they figured in on your  
21 decision-making when proposing the project?

22           KRISTI BLACK: I'm not a decision-maker. Do you  
23 mean deciding the environmentally superior alternative?

24           SPEAKER 12: Correct.

25           KRISTI BLACK: I don't believe that the general

1 economic impact on residents of Lake Elsinore was  
2 considered.

3 SPEAKER 12: Thank you.

4 KRISTI BLACK: Can I have a new person.

5 GRANT TAYLOR: Good evening. Thank you for being  
6 here tonight. My name is Grant Taylor. I'm with the  
7 City of Lake Elsinore. I just wanted a few questions for  
8 clarification, if I could.

9 Looking at your dual track of the CEQA and the  
10 General Proceeding, it talks about the CPUC making the  
11 final determination, the Administrative Law Judge. I'm  
12 assuming that's up at the main office in San Francisco.  
13 Is the city allowed or invited to attend that meeting?

14 MR. UCHIDA: Is the city invited to the proceeding?

15 GRANT TAYLOR: The City of Lake Elsinore will bear  
16 the brunt of this project for everybody else's service.  
17 We'd really like to be present at that meeting if at all  
18 possible.

19 MR. UCHIDA: It should be included as a project  
20 proceeding.

21 GRANT TAYLOR: will we have to request that? Will we  
22 get an invite?

23 MR. UCHIDA: No. If you give me your information,  
24 I'll get it to the law clerk.

25 GRANT TAYLOR: I appreciate that.

1           The EIR was very thorough, about the size of  
2 Britannica Encyclopedia. I didn't have a lot of time to  
3 review it, but from what I saw, I saw scales of the  
4 poles; I saw how many there were. Was there a map in the  
5 EIR that shows the locations? I didn't see that. I want  
6 to make sure the poles are outside of our ultimate  
7 right-of-ways. When we improve our streets for  
8 development, we don't want a pole in the middle of the  
9 street that has to be moved later. Was there a map for  
10 that effect in there? I didn't see it.

11           KRISTI BLACK: I do believe there is one. The other  
12 tool that we have is through the project websites. It's  
13 a web viewer, and I'm going to try to pull it out.

14           So if you go to either Alberhill or  
15 Valley-Ivyglen websites, look for Web Viewer Link, and it  
16 will pull up this web viewer, and it works just like  
17 Google maps. You can zoom in, zoom out.

18           GRANT TAYLOR: And it will give you those locations?

19           KRISTI BLACK: Yeah. This third from the left item  
20 is called layers, and then turn on the ASP structure  
21 locations and you can scroll down and Valley-Ivyglen is  
22 in here too. And then you can zoom in to where you're  
23 interested in, and you can see -- so this is just for  
24 example. This is near SCE's proposed substation sites.  
25 You can see the locations of the structures.

1 GRANT TAYLOR: Very good.

2 Also, I didn't see any specifics on the  
3 substation. Are there any elevations, renderings, that  
4 show the massing, how big it is?

5 All I saw was a little site plan. It talked  
6 about 20-foot walls. It talked about a 49-foot structure  
7 for switch back racks, which I have no idea what those  
8 are.

9 Were there any type of renderings that I  
10 missed in there?

11 SILVIA YANEZ: Normally the substation layout and  
12 the map of the site --

13 GRANT TAYLOR: I saw the site plan, yes. That was  
14 it?

15 SILVIA YANEZ: The viewer can give you different  
16 elevations --

17 KRISTI BLACK: Do you want to see a visual  
18 simulation or --

19 GRANT TAYLOR: I want to see --

20 KRISTI BLACK: -- or more of an engineering drawing?

21 GRANT TAYLOR: It's the entryway to our city. I  
22 want to see what it looks like. When I hear a solid  
23 49-foot steel structure, I go, "What does that look  
24 like?"

25 KRISTI BLACK: There are some visual simulations.

1 That's not in the project description. It's in the  
2 aesthetics.

3 GRANT TAYLOR: Okay. So it's the view samples?

4 KRISTI BLACK: Yeah, and also in the map books at  
5 the front table we have them.

6 GRANT TAYLOR: Okay. Very good.

7 The CPUC did the bare minimum public review.  
8 45 days is the bare minimum. That's what we got.

9 This is a big document. I'm really wondering  
10 if the CPUC can give us some more time. There's a lot of  
11 stuff to look at. At least 60 days, preferably 90 days  
12 to give us more time to make some meaningful comments and  
13 not rush and miss things.

14 MR. UCHIDA: We'll discuss that internally and see  
15 what we can do.

16 GRANT TAYLOR: Thank you very much.

17 KRISTI BLACK: Thank you.

18 SPEAKER 13: I live in an unincorporated area of  
19 (inaudible) lines going through District 1 which is  
20 County, Riverside County, which means that the people who  
21 represent me are in the county, not the city of Lake  
22 Elsinore. Are these people also going to be notified?

23 Furthermore, Wildomar I noticed that the lines  
24 go up the outlet channel on (inaudible).

25 KRISTI BLACK: We notified the local cities and the

1 county. In fact, we've had meetings with Riverside  
2 County, particularly about development along State Route  
3 74 that's planned.

4 SPEAKER 14: Quick question. I'm using your web  
5 here, and you show the staging area --

6 I live in the Rosetta Canyon Community which  
7 is part of the (inaudible) and Central and you chose a  
8 staging area that affects my home. But that's neither  
9 here nor there, but right outside of our community the  
10 path that you've chosen, it's like an S tag. It requires  
11 a guy-wire on our property. We're in a specific planned  
12 area where we have great lakes and we pay a lot of taxes  
13 because all of our utilities are underground, and you  
14 want to put a guy-wire right actually at the monument to  
15 our association.

16 Is there a way that you can -- What's the  
17 determination for using a pole that doesn't require a  
18 guy-wire, like double steel structured pole as opposed to  
19 one that does require it. And further you guys bought  
20 the property and put --

21 KRISTI BLACK: We're not SCE. I just want to  
22 interrupt and say I'm not SCE. We evaluate the project  
23 as they propose it.

24 So I would actually recommend getting in touch  
25 with SCE. They're here.

1           SPEAKER 14 : We did in 2010.

2           KRISTI BLACK: Do you mind raising your hands, SCE,  
3 where you can direct him with specific questions about  
4 this, and I would also recommend still submitting a  
5 comment on the Draft EIR about that as well. But the  
6 reasons of why they're proposed -- that we evaluate the  
7 project as they propose it.

8           SPEAKER 14: You just evaluate the pole there and  
9 the environmental impact of that.

10          KRISTI BLACK: What's the last part again?

11          SPEAKER 14: If that pole has any type of  
12 environmental impact.

13          KRISTI BLACK: Right.

14          SPEAKER 15: I think it would be very good for you  
15 to give one of those books to the city of Lake Elsinore  
16 since there's so much involved in this situation. To  
17 Mr. -- where is he?

18          GRANT TAYLOR: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.

19          SPEAKER 15: I asked if they'd give you, city of  
20 Lake Elsinore, one of these books here so you can be able  
21 to tell people if they want to come into the office and  
22 ask questions.

23          GRANT TAYLOR: Great idea. Already done. We have  
24 one at the public counter. If anybody wants one, couple  
25 of the staff members have one. We'd be glad to let you

1 look and share. We printed out some hard copies of the  
2 disks. Feel free to come by the community development  
3 part of the city hall.

4 KRISTI BLACK: Thank you.

5 SPEAKER 16: On the Ivyglenn Project, can I ask why  
6 the two undergrounds got approved and what their  
7 reasoning to do that was for?

8 KRISTI BLACK: The proposed project has not been  
9 approved. Or are you asking about the --

10 SPEAKER 16: You said there's two areas that were  
11 underground.

12 KRISTI BLACK: Valley-Ivyglenn Segment 7 is proposed  
13 to be underground and it's 2 miles long.

14 SPEAKER 16: What is the reasoning that they're  
15 proposing that?

16 KRISTI BLACK: SCE?

17 SPEAKER 16: How come they're laughing?

18 KRISTI BLACK: I don't think they're laughing.

19 SCE SPEAKER: Edison is here today out of respect  
20 for the process --

21 SPEAKER: We can't hear what she's saying.

22 SCE SPEAKER: So we'll allow that process to go  
23 forward. We have a hotline that you can call Edison.

24 KRISTI BLACK: Thank you. I appreciate that.

25 SPEAKER 16: She doesn't want to answer?

1 KRISTI BLACK: She's going to provide you with a way  
2 to ask them questions like that. Because some of these  
3 questions as to why they proposed it a certain way,  
4 that's not what we know. So I'm kind of putting them on  
5 the spot, actually, by saying that, but they do have a  
6 team that can answer questions like that.

7 SPEAKER 17: So she can't answer what the  
8 determining factor to going underground are?

9 KRISTI BLACK: Again, they propose that segment  
10 underground.

11 SPEAKER 16: Why?

12 KRISTI BLACK: SCE is going to provide you with a  
13 person to get in touch with to answer that. It's not a  
14 CPUC project. The CPUC did not determine certain  
15 segments would be proposed underground or overhead.

16 SPEAKER 17: On your rendering up here, how far can  
17 you zoom in on that rendering? Can we actually see the  
18 dimensions of those poles?

19 KRISTI BLACK: No. They're just point data.

20 SPEAKER 17: Point data. Okay. So where in your  
21 aesthetics are you addressing the visual rendering of  
22 what those poles are going to look like throughout Lake  
23 Elsinore? Are we seeing before photos and after photos  
24 of what the proposal looks like?

25 KRISTI BLACK: In the aesthetic section there are

1 visual simulations, including one of the substation  
2 sites. We have the Draft EIR up here, and we also have  
3 some map books that have those simulation drawings.

4 SPEAKER 17: Including all those 27 miles of  
5 transmission lines?

6 KRISTI BLACK: No. They're at key view points that  
7 have been identified.

8 SPEAKER 17: So back to your slide that talks about  
9 the aesthetics, how are you planning to mitigate the  
10 aesthetics?

11 KRISTI BLACK: The mitigation is in the Draft EIR.  
12 Again, for Alberhill we've identified that it's a  
13 significant and unavoidable aesthetic impact; so it  
14 cannot be mitigated to less than significant.

15 SPEAKER: That is based on cost?

16 KRISTI BLACK: That's because if you look at the  
17 picture of the substation, if you put up -- you can't  
18 shield it. It's a big change from --

19 SPEAKER: I'm talking about the transmission lines  
20 themselves. So there's no way to underground those lines  
21 and mitigate the aesthetics is what you're telling me?

22 KRISTI BLACK: The aesthetics of the 115 kV lines,  
23 the impact of those outside of the substation site were  
24 found to be less than significant with mitigation in  
25 several places, and mitigation there's several measures,

1 and it's in the Draft EIR.

2 SPEAKER: In the Draft EIR, does it address the  
3 difference in cost between undergrounding on a per mile  
4 basis?

5 KRISTI BLACK: No, it does not.

6 SPEAKER: How do we get those numbers?

7 KRISTI BLACK: That's not part of the environmental  
8 review. If you want to submit a comment for that, you're  
9 welcome to.

10 SPEAKER: There will be plenty of comments, but I'm  
11 just saying the suggestion that the two miles that you're  
12 undergrounding versus the 27 (inaudible) as to who makes  
13 that decision on aesthetics and what the differential is  
14 in cost, and we're --

15 KRISTI BLACK: Again, SCE proposed the project that  
16 way; so we're evaluating it.

17 The CPUC cannot require mitigation for impacts  
18 that have been found less than significant, and CPUC can  
19 only require mitigation from significant to less than  
20 significant, and there is mitigation in the EIR to reduce  
21 certain aesthetic impacts to less than significant.

22 SPEAKER: What does the CPUC consider less than  
23 significant on a visual site line to the lake.

24 KRISTI BLACK: I'm going to have to request that you  
25 read the Draft EIR because I think other people have some

1 comments, and this discussion about aesthetics could take  
2 up a lot of time; so I'm going to ask that for --

3 Thank you.

4 SPEAKER: Could you rewind? I think you said no --  
5 I think this is what you said. You said according to the  
6 environment there's going to be significant, I don't  
7 know, habitat problems and that can not be mitigated; so  
8 wouldn't that automatically say you can't do the project?

9 KRISTI BLACK: The biological resources impacts can  
10 be mitigated to less than significant. The CPUC can  
11 approve a project that has significant environmental  
12 impacts. It would have to issue what's called a  
13 statement of overriding considerations.

14 SPEAKER: What is that?

15 KRISTI BLACK: You can provide a comment on the  
16 Draft EIR and be involved in the CEQA process.

17 SPEAKER: Is the online map you're using here part  
18 of the Draft EIR?

19 KRISTI BLACK: It's not. It's a tool to be able to  
20 see -- you know, a lot of people want to see where poles  
21 are in relation to their house or whatever, and it's just  
22 a tool to help that, but it is the same data that was  
23 used for the maps in the EIR.

24 SPEAKER: I'll be submitting a proposal comment on  
25 this. Just so you know, Grant, as she pointed out to

1 you, this is the only way to drill down into where the  
2 towers are. There are parts of this where when you  
3 activate the layer that says where the structures are,  
4 they actually don't line up with where the line is and  
5 that impacts one of my properties. I think you and I  
6 talked about that and you said, "I'm not sure which is  
7 correct. Why don't you come to the meeting." That's a  
8 little frustrating.

9 KRISTI BLACK: I think the lines are conceptual  
10 because if you zoom out, you know, the scale doesn't  
11 matter as much, but the poles are more accurate.

12 I would recommend you submitting a comment on  
13 that. That's something we can address.

14 SPEAKER: I have something that has been bugging me  
15 and that is, why are these lines going up?

16 KRISTI BLACK: SCE is proposing these lines for the  
17 objectives that were in the presentation and are also in  
18 the Draft EIR. So the Draft EIR describes why SCE is  
19 proposing this and it has to do in general with  
20 reliability. There's been a lot of growth in the area,  
21 and there will be in the future, and this is meant to  
22 address that.

23 SPEAKER: I thought that's what solar panels were  
24 for.

25 KRISTI BLACK: If you would like to submit that as a

1 comment, you are welcome to.

2 Any more questions, or do we want to take a  
3 quick break?

4 One more.

5 SPEAKER: If the city decided to amend its  
6 underground ordinance to require the lines be underground  
7 throughout the city, would you have to redo the EIR?

8 KRISTI BLACK: That's something we would have to  
9 discuss internally. I don't have an answer to that right  
10 now.

11 SPEAKER: Fair enough. Thank you.

12 KRISTI BLACK: Yes.

13 SPEAKER: I'll save mine.

14 SPEAKER: Just one final question. I'm new to this  
15 so I'm just getting up to speed, if I can get up to  
16 speed. But the idea is Southern California Edison  
17 basically proposed this route and gave it to you to then  
18 go and research and prepare the EIR; is that correct?

19 KRISTI BLACK: Right.

20 SPEAKER: All the decisions made as to what was  
21 underground or routing, everything, was done by Southern  
22 California Edison, not you people?

23 KRISTI BLACK: For the proposed project.

24 SPEAKER: For the Valley-Ivyglen project.

25 KRISTI BLACK: Yes. SCE proposed the project.

1 That's what's described in Chapter 2, but the  
2 alternatives that are analyzed are what the CPUC has come  
3 up with.

4 SPEAKER: Those alternatives are binding or only  
5 recommendations?

6 KRISTI BLACK: They are recommendations. We look at  
7 alternatives, select environmentally superior -- one for  
8 Alberhill, one for Valley-IvyGlen. The commission, when  
9 it's making its decision at the end of this process, they  
10 don't have to agree with that decision and can approve  
11 different alternatives. There's some procedural hoops to  
12 that.

13 SPEAKER: Who decides what's acceptable as far as  
14 the mitigation is concerned? Are we involved in that  
15 decision?

16 KRISTI BLACK: You can definitely comment on the  
17 mitigation and say that you don't like a mitigation  
18 measure or propose an additional mitigation measure or  
19 say you don't think one is sufficient.

20 SPEAKER: Is our city involved in the final  
21 decision? Not the individual but our city.

22 KRISTI BLACK: What do you -- can you clarify?

23 SPEAKER: Are elected officials involved in the  
24 final decision as to what's acceptable for our city?

25 Do we lose control of our city's ability to

1 make decisions, what's best for us?

2 Other than comments, do we actually have any  
3 power to impact what's best for our city?

4 KRISTI BLACK: As Jensen stated, the city can get  
5 involved in the administrative proceeding process. I'm  
6 not sure what you mean by power or anything like that.

7 SPEAKER: Do we have -- who approves it?

8 KRISTI BLACK: The California Public Utilities  
9 Commission has jurisdiction over approving SCE's  
10 application or denying it or approving an alternative.

11 SPEAKER: Thank you.

12 KRISTI BLACK: Okay. Next.

13 SPEAKER: One question. The city of Chino Hills of  
14 Group Valley were slated at a noneconomically superior  
15 project, just like you were saying for us; however, they  
16 thought that it was undergrounded after all.

17 Why was, after that proceeding that has been  
18 going through it, and now in fact they are -- why is our  
19 city not allowed to have the more aesthetically appealing  
20 yet economically less feasible project?

21 What determination do you guys use within your  
22 analysis of the DEIR to determine that our city is going  
23 to support it aesthetically?

24 KRISTI BLACK: That was a very long complicated  
25 question. I would say the Draft EIR is prepared pursuant

1 to CEQA.

2 CPUC has a duty to mitigate significant  
3 impacts to less than significant or if not less than  
4 significant to the extent that's feasible.

5 If you disagree with conclusions in the EIR,  
6 including conclusions about undergrounding, I invite you  
7 to submit a comment on that.

8 SPEAKER: So our city is going to have to spend \$2  
9 million by (inaudible) to the CPUC like they did over a  
10 five-year period? I mean.

11 KRISTI BLACK: I'm not sure what you want me to say  
12 about that. Our team is here preparing the EIR pursuant  
13 to CEQA. I can't speak to what was done on other  
14 projects or outside of the CEQA process on this project.

15 SPEAKER: Thank you.

16 KRISTI BLACK: I think that's all the questions.

17 We can either take a quick break or we can  
18 jump right into the verbal comment period. Let's just do  
19 a show of hands, who wants to take a quick break?

20 I think we're going to go right into the  
21 comment period. Looks like a minority of people.

22 What we're going to do, we have a court  
23 reporter here. She is over on your left.

24 So Jessica has the speaker cards that were  
25 filled out earlier, and you're still welcome to submit

1 speaker cards if you think of something that you want to  
2 say, and she will bring the microphone to you. And I  
3 suggest speaking directly to the court reporter so that  
4 she's able to record your comments. And members of the  
5 audience, while other people are giving comments, please  
6 keep any comments, clapping, anything, to yourself so  
7 that the court reporter can hear everything and record  
8 everything accurately.

9 JESSICA MIDBUST: Terry Morarty.

10 KRISTI BLACK: Sorry, Jessica, if I can interrupt.  
11 We're going to limit comments now to three minutes.  
12 Silvia up here on the right will give you --

13 Actually, Silvia, if you can move towards the  
14 court reporter, since people will be speaking toward her.

15 She'll give you a one-minute warning. If we  
16 still have time left after the comment period, people who  
17 have already commented can speak again, but right now  
18 let's limit it to 3 minutes.

19 JESSICA MIDBUST: I'm going to walk around and hand  
20 this to people who have submitted comment cards.

21

22 VERBAL COMMENTS

23

24 JESSICA MIDBUST: Terry Morarty.

25 TERRY MORARTY: I would just like to suggest that

1 you go with the Option M and put it all underground. The  
2 aesthetics is the main thing to me. The Valley, we live  
3 in a beautiful Valley and the more things like this that  
4 are put into our area, the worse it looks. And I just  
5 think it all needs to go underground. That's all.

6 KRISTI BLACK: Next speaker is John C. Gray.

7 JOHN GRAY: 50 years ago the health hazards of  
8 smoking cigarettes was not yet acknowledged.

9 50 years from now the health detrimental  
10 effects of the strong electromagnetic fields surrounding  
11 high tension wires might get acknowledged, depending on  
12 who pays for the study. Undergrounding reduces the  
13 electromagnetic fields significantly. There is a strong  
14 health reason, as well as aesthetic, to underground all  
15 the lines in the entire project.

16 KRISTI BLACK: The next commenter is Ace Vallejos.

17 ACE VALLEJOS: My comment is that we need to get --  
18 I did not know anything about this. There's a lot of  
19 people in the area, I feel, that don't know about this.

20 And my opinion, we need to have more time and  
21 need to do a better job of notifying the community so we  
22 all know what's going on and so we can give our input  
23 adequately. That's my comment.

24 KRISTI BLACK: Thank you. The next commenter is  
25 Larry Namedal.

1           LARRY NAMEDAL: Well, I'm looking at a map and  
2 there's a Serrano Valley line on the other side of the  
3 15. Why don't they follow that?

4           You don't have this map. And it's going to  
5 the same place; so you wouldn't have to come through Lake  
6 Elsinore. You wouldn't even have to come down the 74.  
7 The line is already in. Just put the towers next to all  
8 this, and keep it out of our sight, because it's going to  
9 impact the property values. People are not going to come  
10 out here anymore. And I bought a house out here because  
11 it's supposed to be a nice area. I didn't buy a house to  
12 look at high tension lines.

13           And that's not even in your map, your little  
14 book, about the other line, is it? Yes? No?

15           KRISTI BLACK: This period is just for comments.  
16 We're not responding.

17           The next commenter is Chris Hyland.

18           CHRIS HYLAND: I pass. I've already got mine in.

19           KRISTI BLACK: Next commenter is John O'Doherty.

20           JOHN O'DOHORTY: Good evening. My name is John  
21 O'Doherty, and I'm a property owner on 3rd Street. And I  
22 did review the Draft EIR, particularly in relation to  
23 segment VIG which is mostly on 3rd Street. And I have  
24 these comments here, and I have already e-mailed them to  
25 your organization.

1           And the first one is a minor one, is that in  
2 reading the study most people look at the I-15 as going  
3 north-south, and, of course, north is kind of 45 degrees,  
4 and the document is a bit confusing with regard to what  
5 is north and what is south or east and west.

6           In any event, if you look at the map up there,  
7 my big question is on the road to the VIG, the Ivyglen,  
8 that shows the map, you can see up there that if you zoom  
9 in on 3rd Street, it makes absolutely no sense to me why  
10 the line is jogged to come south to 3rd street and then  
11 up 3rd Street and then back up. I don't know if it's  
12 Conard, onto 74.

13           My big question is, why was 3rd Street picked  
14 for the routing through the city instead of going all the  
15 way up to 74? And I don't know where that came from.  
16 And I surmise that Edison has an easement on 3rd Street  
17 which is a very minor easement, and that's the excuse for  
18 running the line on 3rd Street with apparent disregard  
19 for everybody on that line.

20           In fact, you talk quite a bit in the report on  
21 saving money -- I should say Edison does -- in the draft  
22 document about saving money, but we're adding  
23 approximately a half a mile of power lines by just  
24 jogging onto 3rd Street instead of turning on 74. And I  
25 really would like to know, and I put that question here,

1 why that decision was made to just come farther south  
2 than necessary, why you just didn't go straight on 74.

3 KRISTI BLACK: 30 seconds.

4 JOHN O'DOHORTY: A lot of people got more time in  
5 questioning.

6 My question, a lot of people asked, of course,  
7 the kind of poles on the location of 3rd Street; so I'll  
8 skip over that one.

9 And I am also asking the question, is  
10 everybody -- is Edison aware of the new drainage, storm  
11 water drainage channels coming down 3rd Street right on  
12 the line where these poles are supposed to go?

13 Also, there is a huge masonry wall built right  
14 under where I understand you mean to put the poles and --

15 KRISTI BLACK: I think we're at time. If we have  
16 more time at the end --

17 JOHN O'DOHORTY: I'm not that far away from being  
18 finished.

19 In reading the document, there seems to be an  
20 awful lot more concern for motorists and what is seen and  
21 the visual effects than there is for the residents and  
22 the property owners along the line. That's kind of an  
23 amazing thing, which brings me to the comment that was  
24 already made, is there absolutely no mention in the  
25 document about electromagnetic radiation, which that

1 gentleman over there brought up. That's a huge, all the  
2 impacts that are mentioned in the document are temporary  
3 impacts during construction. No mention of it of  
4 negative impacts after the whole project is installed.

5           Also, on the underground thing, I was at a  
6 council meeting here some time ago and brought up this  
7 matter, and the city council stated that all the power  
8 lines on 3rd Street were going underground. Now, that  
9 doesn't appear to be very true here.

10           Finally -- two more of my quick points. In  
11 your appendix there is a discussion on the whole idea of  
12 going underground, and the document does state that that  
13 is entirely feasible. So there is no reason why all  
14 these power lines couldn't go underground through the  
15 city of Lake Elsinore.

16           Final point is there are photographs, there  
17 are a whole series of photographs taken of the road of  
18 the VIG line. There isn't one single photograph taken of  
19 3rd Street. 3rd Street is one of the major thoroughfares  
20 in the city, and there isn't a single photograph taken  
21 going up or down 3rd Street showing what's going on  
22 there. So that concerns me. Thank you.

23           KRISTI BLACK: Thank you. Next commenter is Bruce  
24 Slingerland.

25           BRUCE SLINGERLAND: I'm just going to follow the

1 gentleman ahead of me with statements that we're directly  
2 impacted in that same area. And, again, bringing up the  
3 citizens issue -- we did at a prior environmental impact  
4 meeting submit verbally and written, you know, a lot of  
5 issues to the plan, to the proposal. They were going  
6 underground in our areas and, you know, it didn't happen.

7           So my concern is that we're making statements,  
8 we're making written comments, and making verbal  
9 statements and, you know, is it really going to have any  
10 sort of an impact?

11           Like this gentleman said before, the  
12 understanding of the SCE routing of the lines, jogging as  
13 they do, versus just heading straight down Highway 74, or  
14 as the other gentleman proposed, going through an area  
15 that's very rural that doesn't even impact Lake Elsinore.  
16 It's kind of hard to understand SCE's logic in what  
17 they're doing with the routing of their lines. That's  
18 our concerns.

19           I'll also submit written comment to go along  
20 with the verbal statement. That's just my opinion.  
21 Thank you.

22           KRISTI BLACK: The next commenter is Barbara Paul.

23           BARBARA PAUL: Thank you. I'm a resident of the  
24 Temescal Valley. I am also a long-standing member, with  
25 my husband, of Glen Eden Sun Club.

1           Thank you very much for putting this on the  
2 cover of the EIR report. It is a beautiful photograph,  
3 blue skies, white puffy clouds, the 15 freeway looking  
4 south with Glen Eden on the right-hand side.

5           Glen Eden is included in the EIR with  
6 photographs figure 4.1-4A before and after photographs.  
7 I have gone into the map, the layering effect, and I have  
8 seen what is going to happen to the front of Glen Eden  
9 Sun Club. Across Glen Eden property there is proposed  
10 anywhere from 7 to 13 of these poles. You might as well  
11 put a fence, barbed wire on top, with a guard station  
12 because it's going to look like a prison behind there.

13           I am speaking as a long-term member of Glen  
14 Eden. Glen Eden last year submitted their comment letter  
15 and they suggested alternative M, all underground. We  
16 will again, if we have not already done so, submit  
17 another letter by the deadline again suggesting  
18 everything be put underground. That's my comments.  
19 Thank you.

20           KRISTI BLACK: The next commenter is Leonard  
21 Leichnetz.

22           LEONARD LEICHNITZ: Hello. My name is Leonard  
23 Leichnetz. I'm the president of Lumos Communities.  
24 We're the property manager for the old rodeo grounds  
25 which was approved to build some houses. The owner of

1 that is JLJ, and we're the property manager for them.

2           The purpose of the Draft EIR is to allow the  
3 public to comment on environmental impacts for a project,  
4 a proposed project, but it's a little difficult to do  
5 that when you can't tell where it's going to be built.  
6 As we said informally during the Q and A session, you  
7 have an ARCVIEWER available online, and that data  
8 provided is -- there's some discrepancy between where the  
9 structures are going to go and where the line is shown.

10           Now, currently, the right-of-way is across  
11 Franklin from our proposed project or our future project.  
12 At table 2.2 of your Draft EIR, Segment ASP4, it says it  
13 will be located exclusively in existing right-of-way.

14           As I said, on the ARCVIEWER that doesn't seem  
15 to be the case. And that discrepancy is repeated a  
16 couple of times through the EIR, including figure 2.2E,  
17 although it's hard to drill down into them; so I can't  
18 tell exactly.

19           I would ask in the Final EIR that this  
20 discrepancy be resolved because I would have comments on  
21 the environmental impacts that the line could generate if  
22 it were to cross Franklin rather than stay in the  
23 existing right-of-way. Thank you.

24           KRISTI BLACK: Thank you. The next commenter is  
25 Mike Matthews.

1 MIKE MATTHEWS: Hello. My name is Mike Matthews.

2 First, I'll make the -- I don't have a problem  
3 with progress, and we're doing a lot of it in Lake  
4 Elsinore, making the city look nice for the people that  
5 live there, and enticing other people to move in.

6 My issue is with the health, the effects on  
7 health, environmental impacts, and other issues that the  
8 people in Lake Elsinore are going to have with the  
9 erection of these poles.

10 Bruce here, he talked about going through the  
11 3rd Street annexation area with the poles. For some  
12 reason they are having poles erected, 100-foot poles,  
13 come on, 100-foot poles, 16 inches in diameter going  
14 through a residential neighborhood. It's zoned RE,  
15 residential estates. It's a nice little neighborhood,  
16 lots of families.

17 Unfortunately, they didn't choose the most  
18 preferred way, which would be 1,000 feet east of the  
19 neighborhood, which is where existing poles are there  
20 now. You've got SCE owned property. Okay. You got  
21 existing poles, and you could run all the poles you want.

22 If they insist on going through the  
23 neighborhood -- this is one of the few neighborhoods that  
24 you have these high tension wires going through -- why  
25 can't they go underneath the ground? There's no reason

1 why you guys need to put these poles up, impacting the  
2 residents in that area, which include home values, health  
3 issues -- first few people have talked about health  
4 issues. Unfortunately, it's never really good -- set in  
5 stone that there are significant health issues, but there  
6 have been health issues identified.

7           Now, I feel that along with the rest of the  
8 people in my neighborhood, and I'll speak for every one  
9 of them, that an alternate solution be looked at and  
10 taken advantage of instead of impacting the economic and  
11 health of the people in that area. Thank you.

12           KRISTI BLACK: Thank you. The next commenter is  
13 Linda Ridenour.

14           LINDA RIDENOUR: I would like to comment, not having  
15 read your environmental studies, and say, if any of your  
16 studies were based on Alberhill Environmental Studies, I  
17 question them all. The Alberhill -- company hired by  
18 Alberhill had significant areas that didn't include the  
19 vernal pools, et cetera, et cetera. So if there's  
20 anything like that in there, then you need to provide  
21 documentation that you actually did those areas in  
22 question.

23           If there is a species that are sensitive or  
24 endangered, I don't understand how you can mitigate  
25 against that. That does not seem right. If one

1 department of the government says this is a very  
2 important plant or animal, then how can another group  
3 say, "Oh, no, well, it's not important because" -- so  
4 those are some of my problems.

5           Also, these gentlemen have been talking about  
6 human experimentation, because if we find out later on  
7 down the road that those were significant impacts on the  
8 children, on themselves, then that's going to be a  
9 problem. I don't know if they can sue, but certainly  
10 somebody should be held accountable for that.

11           Also, normally during construction there is  
12 tremendous dust, noise, perhaps lights, causing  
13 difficulties with the Palomar lighting area and a whole  
14 bunch of things like that. You say temporary. Temporary  
15 could be months. I think it should be more specific,  
16 although I'm looking forward to reading what you're going  
17 to send me. And I think all these people would like to  
18 know that too. Thank you.

19           KRISTI BLACK: Thank you.

20           Next commenter is Grant Taylor.

21           GRANT TAYLOR: Thank you, again, for coming. We  
22 appreciate the opportunity to hear your presentation,  
23 offer testimony.

24           I understand the need for the project. When  
25 you plug something in, when you turn on a switch, you

1 need electricity. I get it. The concern is the way it's  
2 implemented and the impacts on the residents and the  
3 businesses of Lake Elsinore.

4 This will serve a wide area. I think there  
5 were seven or eight cities in unincorporated county that  
6 would be impacted. Temecula, Murrieta, Murrieta Hot  
7 Springs -- zero impacts, but they will receive the  
8 benefit. I think they should bear some of the cost in  
9 mitigating impact on Lake Elsinore. It's all about  
10 money, the undergrounding, the mitigation.

11 The County of Perris, Menifee, Wildomar, some  
12 impacts, not nearly as much. Lake Elsinore will bear the  
13 brunt of these impacts, these poles zigzagging through  
14 our cities.

15 I would hope that the California Public  
16 Utilities Commission would be willing to work with the  
17 city to find ways to address the aesthetics, mitigate the  
18 impacts, soften the impacts, and protect our residents  
19 and our businesses.

20 Also, future developments -- finally the great  
21 recession is over. We have a number of very good  
22 projects on the books. I would hate for this project to  
23 disrupt projects that are underway or deter any future  
24 projects that would bring commerce, some money to help us  
25 improve our city.

1           We very much look forward to an invitation to  
2 the California Public Utilities Commission decision. We  
3 would like to see the five commissioners, hear their  
4 deliberations, offer testimony, feel that our voices were  
5 heard.

6           And last, but not least, we very much like an  
7 extension of that 45 days. For a document that resembles  
8 the Britannica Encyclopedia it's a lot to digest. At  
9 least 60 to 90 days to give us an opportunity to be  
10 thorough, do our due diligence, and provide meaningful  
11 comments. Thank you.

12           KRISTI BLACK: Thank you. That's the last speaker  
13 card that we have.

14           Did anybody else want to make a verbal  
15 comment?

16           Our next speaker is Kim Cousins.

17           KIM COUSINS: I have to comment on the presentation.  
18 I fully believe it's a little disingenuous for us to see  
19 a map with blue lines or dots on the map as far as where  
20 a tower could be or individual tower is placed on the  
21 drill down without understanding the aesthetic impact on  
22 the community in total.

23           Certainly in neighborhoods power lines don't  
24 need to be strung, and they certainly can be underground,  
25 but this is a pristine Valley, that we're very proud of,

1 that is on a major growth pattern, third fastest growing  
2 city in the Riverside County, fifth fastest growing in  
3 the state of California, and this can significantly  
4 impact us financially as far as attempting to attract new  
5 homeowners, as well as businesses, to this community.

6           You know, when you have a city council and  
7 planning commission that review the paint colors on a  
8 building and the color of materials, its brick or a wood  
9 or rock on the sides of the building, and we have this  
10 kind of a presentation that doesn't show the aesthetic  
11 impact, it doesn't do any service to this community  
12 whatsoever. So I highly encourage you -- as Grant said,  
13 we need a longer extended period of time. The city  
14 council of this city is empowered to speak on behalf of  
15 these citizens, and they need to be at the table having  
16 those discussions about what you're attempting to do with  
17 this City for the future.

18           KRISTI BLACK: Thank you. Does anyone else want to  
19 make a comment?

20                   So I think that concludes our meeting.

21                   Thank you all for coming. As a reminder, the  
22 comment period ends May 31st, the day after the holiday,  
23 and we look forward to getting your written comments  
24 after this meeting.

25                   There is another meeting tomorrow, if you

1 would like to come to that. It's in the afternoon in  
2 Perris.

3 Thank you.

4 (Whereupon the proceedings concluded)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, ELIZABETH EGGLI, CSR NO. 6241, CERTIFIED  
SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DO  
HEREBY CERTIFY:

THAT I TOOK IN SHORTHAND THE PROCEEDINGS IN THIS  
MATTER, AND THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND  
CORRECT TRANSCRIPTION OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES.

I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT I HAVE NO INTEREST IN THE  
OUTCOME OF THE ACTION.

WITNESS MY HAND THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF

\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
ELIZABETH EGGLI, CSR NO. 6241  
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN  
AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA